

REMARKS

The Examiner's remarks and rejections set forth in the Office Action have now been fully considered. In response thereto, Applicants have amended the specification in order to correct a few typographical errors that inadvertently occurred therein. Additionally, the particular sequence identification numbers have been added to the primers listed on page 9 as requested by the Examiner. By inserting the SEQ ID NO's next to the appropriate sequences in the specification, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's previous objection to the specification has been overcome.

Furthermore, claims 7-8 have been deleted from the application (without prejudice) and claims 6 and 9 have been amended in order to more particularly set forth the reasonable scope of the invention as suggested by the Examiner. New claims 19-54 have also been added to address the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 112 concerns. The newly submitted claims are all directed to detecting the presence of a mutation either exon 2 or exon 26 of the NPHS1 gene. In view of the above amendments and the following additional comments, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6-9 as allegedly lacking written description and/or as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112. However, the amended and newly submitted claims now specifically identify the nephric gene as "NPHS1 gene." Additionally, the newly submitted claims particularly recite the NPHS1 gene with a mutation in exon 2 or exon 26.

The NPHS1 gene is clearly described in the specification and shown in the drawings. It is also listed in the Sequence Listing as "SEQ ID NO: 1." The NPHS1 gene encodes for the gene product nephrin as shown in SEQ ID NO: 2. Clearly, reference to the "NPHS1 gene" makes it clear that Applicants are not referring to the nephrin hormone, etc., but to the specific gene which encodes for the gene product nephrin (SEQ ID NO: 2), a putative cell adhesion and signaling receptor. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully believe that the Examiner's written description and/or indefinite rejections have been surpassed.

Lastly, the Examiner also rejected claims 6-9 as reportedly lacking positive, active steps. It is respectfully submitted that the amended and newly submitted

claims recite such steps. Consequently, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit the above amendments and remarks overcome all objections and rejections issued by the Examiner and place the application in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the objections and rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is thus respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants attorneys at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

**FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP**

DATED: August 12, 2003



Richard J. Minnich (Reg. No. 24, 175)

Richard M. Klein (Reg. No. 33,000)

1100 Superior Avenue

Seventh Floor

Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2518

Tel: (216) 861-5582

Fax: (216) 241-1666

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 12, 2003.



Lynda S. Kalemba